

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-8, 10-25 and 27-31 are pending. No claims have been canceled or added. No claims have been amended.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-8, 10-25 and 27-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,338,056 of Dessloch (“Dessloch”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,535 of Underwood (“Underwood”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,643,661 of Polizzi (“Polizzi”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, “defining **an index field map object** to map one or more **business components** to one or more result fields associated with a search engine, the index field map object including an index field type” (Claim 1, emphasis added). As noted in the Office Action, Dessloch does not teach mapping one or more business components to one or more result fields associated with a search engine (Office Action, p. 3). Furthermore, Polizzi fails to disclose at least the limitation set forth above. However, it was argued in the Office Action that Underwood discloses business objects mapping and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dessloch’s disclosure with Underwood’s to create the invention as claimed (Office Action, pp. 3-4). Applicants respectfully disagree because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Dessloch with Underwood for many reasons.

According to Underwood, *business components are isolated from a direct access to relational databases* to accommodate legacy databases (Underwood, col. 90, ln. 42-

53). On the other hand, object identifiers are mapped to row identifiers *in a relational database* in Dessloch (Dessloch, col. 3, ln. 34-38). Since the business components in Underwood are isolated from a direct access to relational databases, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Dessloch to map the business components in Underwood to the row identifiers in the relational database. Therefore, Underwood teaches *away* from modifying the mapping of object identifiers to relational database row identifiers in Dessloch with the business components in Underwood.

In addition to Underwood, Dessloch also teaches away from modifying its system with the disclosure in Underwood to define an *index field map object* to map one or more business components to one or more result fields associated with the search engine. According to Dessloch, it is *not an easy task to implement and integrate a new index mechanism into an existing database engine* because of its interaction with central database components such as locking and recovery management (Dessloch, col. 2, ln.59-63; emphasis added). The proposed modification of Dessloch to define an index field map object to map the business components in Underwood to the row identifiers for a table stored in the relational database is, in effect, implementing a new index mechanism into an existing database engine. Rather than providing a motivation, Dessloch actually *discourages such modification* by warning that it is not an easy task. Therefore, Dessloch also teaches away from the proposed modification in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Underwood discloses mapping the business components to entry fields of a *user interface*. (Underwood, col. 30, ln. 58-60). The business components mapping in Underwood is irrelevant to database applications. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to apply the business component mapping in Underwood to the database system in Dessloch. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is

patentable over Dessloch in view of Underwood and Polizzi. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 10, 16, 21, and 27 are patentable over Dessloch in view of Underwood and Polizzi. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Claims 2-8, 11-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 28-31 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 16, 21, and 27, respectively. Therefore, claims 2-8, 11-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 28-30 are patentable over Dessloch in view of Underwood and Polizzi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

### CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/19, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300